DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 005 CG 007 745

AUTHOR Silverman, Manuel S.; Quinn, Philip F.
TITLE Objective Ratings of Monitor-Modeling Supervision in Practicum.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 18p.
AVAILABLE FROM Manuel S. Silverman, Department of Guidance and Counseling, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60611

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Evaluation; *Counselor Performance; *Counselor Training; Evaluation Methods; Feedback; Individual Counseling; Interpersonal Relationship; *Practicum Supervision; Research Projects; *Supervisory Methods; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Two groups of 12 practicum trainees were exposed to either Monitor-modeling or Immediate-feedback supervision. Ten minute counseling sessions with coached clients were taped before and after the practicum. Three independent judges rated the tapes, using Carkhuff's scales for "Gross ratings of facilitative interpersonal functioning" to assess the level of facilitative conditions offered by the trainees, and the trainees' action orientation (Carkhuff, 1969). Results indicated that: (1) the judges' ratings from pre-test to post-test increased significantly for the Monitor-modeling group, but not for the Immediate-feedback group; (2) although the results approached significance, there were no significant differences between the two groups on the post-test; and (3) the amount of growth from pre-test to post-test was significantly greater from the Monitor-modeling group. Since the ratings used in this study were considered to be a more accurate evaluation of facilitative skills than the global ratings used in a previous study with similar results, these data lend further support to the relative effectiveness of Monitor-modeling supervision. Due to the small sample and the local situation of the study, additional research is recommended. References are included. (Author)

ED 071005

OBJECTIVE RATINGS OF MONITOR-MODELING SUPERVISION IN PRACTICUM

Manuel S. Silverman

Loyola University of Chicago

and

Philip F. Quinn, S. J.

St. Joseph's Hospital

Tampa, Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 007 745

Recent reviews of the literature indicate that until the past several years, there has been a relatively small amount of published material on the supervision of counseling (Patterson, 1964; Cash & Munger, 1966; Hansen & Warner, 1971). Although the number of research studies on supervision has continually been on the increase, an examination of the existing literature reveals that almost all articles about practicum, or certain phases of supervision, rely on established practicum procedures. Little research has incorporated the evaluation of new or more creative supervisory procedures developed from psychological or sociological models.

One supervisory procedure that has not been widely explored is that of having an experienced counselor present with the practicum trainee during actual interviews. Such a team approach may prove exceedingly helpful in developing counseling effectiveness in trainees. Dreikurs (1950), Lott (1952, 1957), Cornwell (1959), Mallers (1968), and Silverman & Quinn (in press) have all investigated the value of such procedures, and they all support the use of such team approaches to supervision.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This present experiment attempted to compare the effectiveness of a particular form of a team approach to supervision to the effectiveness of what is considered to be a more "standard" approach to supervision.

Monitor-modeling supervision. Monitor-modeling placed the supervisor in the room with the trainee, and it appeared to the client that both the trainee and the supervisor were co-counselors. However, the trainee was in direct control of the interview; the supervisor was only identified as a second counselor. He interceded occasionally with a more accurate response only when he perceived that the trainee had missed the communication from the client or was pursuing a tangential point. The supervisor's responses served to "monitor" or regulate the session, as well as provide a "model" type of communication.

Immediate-feedback supervision. In the Immediate-feedback situation, the trainees had their tapes reviewed immediately following the counseling sessions. During this 45 minute period, the supervisor would play segments of the tape, ask questions of the trainees, and offer comments and suggestions. This procedure was based on the idea that in "going over the tape" with a supervisor, the trainee could learn to affect a more efficient counseling relationship.

Hypotheses. After initially establishing the equivalency of the two groups at the outset of the experiment, the following specific null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no significant differences between pre-test and post-test judges' ratings for the Monitor-modeling group.
2. There are no significant differences between pre-test and post-test

judges' ratings for the Immediate-feedback group.

3. There are no significant differences between post-test judges' ratings for the two groups.

4. There are no significant differences between the pre-test to post-test change in judges' ratings for the two groups.

Method

Sample. The trainees were 24 students enrolled in the practicum in guidance and counseling at Loyola University of Chicago, second semester, 1970-71. They were divided into two groups of 12 on the basis of age, sex, occupation, and counseling experience. Normative data for the trainees is summarized in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The live clients seen by the trainees during the practicum were high school students at Angel Guardian Orphanage in Chicago, Illinois. The average age of the clients was 16. Their concerns involved domestic issues in the orphanage, past treatment, future plans, and issues in their own family lives.

The clients seen for the purposes of the analyses of this study were drama students trained to serve as coached clients, all presenting the same school-related personal problem.

There were three supervisors in the practicum.[2] All had previous experience in practicum supervision. Two were doctoral candidates in counselor education, and the third possessed the doctorate in that field.

The school of counseling followed by the supervisors could be loosely defined as "Neo-client-centered."

Instrument. The form for "Gross ratings of facilitative interpersonal functioning" (Carkhuff, 1969) was used to establish the levels of facilitation and action orientation of the trainees in their pre and post-practicum interviews with coached clients.

Procedures. Each trainee taped a ten minute counseling session with a coached client prior to the first class meeting of the practicum. Following this, 12 trainees were exposed to Monitor-modeling supervision, and 12 trainees were exposed to Immediate-feedback supervision. Each trainee had four such supervisory sessions during the practicum. With the exception of the differential supervision in these four sessions, practicum experiences for all 24 trainees were generally similar in content and process.[3] At the end of the course, each trainee again taped a ten minute session with a different coached client.

The pre and post-practicum tapes were then rated by three independent judges. The judges, two women and one man, all possessed doctorates in counseling and guidance and had at least two years of experience in practicum supervision. They were all presently teaching or counseling, or both, in local colleges and universities. The judges rated each individual trainee response from 1 (worst) to 5 (best) according to Carkhuff's criteria. Any and all verbal utterances by the trainees during these ten minute sessions were considered responses and were rated. Prior to the evaluation of the tapes, the judges participated in two training sessions in evaluative procedures. The judges responded to 44 items on three taped interviews.

A z test was used to establish the extent of inner consistency on these items between the three judges and expert ratings (Freund & Williams, 1964). The z scores for the three judges (.38. .37, & .03), indicated a high degree of inner consistency (.05 level = $\pm$1.97). Mean judges' ratings were 2.40, 2.43, and 2.30. The mean expert rating was 2.31.

After gathering and organizing the data, t statistics were used to analyse pre to post test differences for each group of subjects, and to analyse differences in amount of growth from pre to post between the two groups of subjects. Due to the fact that there was some slight difference between the two groups on the pre-test, analysis of covariance was used to examine post-test differences between the two groups.

Results

At the beginning of the practicum, all trainees interviewed one of three trained drama students presenting the same school-related personal problem. Pre-test ratings were compared to establish the equivalency of the two groups. No significant differences were found between the two groups on the pre-test judges' ratings. These results support the assumption of equivalence.

In the comparison of the Monitor-modeling group from pre to post-practicum on the judges' ratings, the pre-test mean was 1.55, and the post-test mean was 2.20. The difference of .65 yielded a t value of 3.55, significant at the .01 level. These ratings indicated a significant improvement for the Monitor-modeling group. These results are summarized in Table 2.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

In the comparison of the Immediate-feedback group from pre to post-practicum on the judges' ratings, the pre-test mean was 1.76, and the post-test mean was 1.89. The difference of .13 yielded a t value of .50, which was not significant. These findings are summarized in Table 3.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

In relation to the relative effectiveness of the two methods of supervision, the Monitor-modeling group had a somewhat lower mean rating on the pre-test, and a somewhat higher rating on the post-test. On the post-test, the Monitor-modeling mean judges' rating was 2.20, while the Immediate-feedback mean judges' rating was 1.89. Analysis of covariance yielded an F score of 3.13, with a probability level of .09. These results are summarized in Table 4.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The final analysis is summarized in Table 5. This analysis evaluated differences in the change in judges' ratings from pre-test to post-test between the two groups. The mean change for the Monitor-modeling group was .65, and the mean change for the Immediate-feedback group was .13. The difference in amount of growth, of .52, yielded a t value of 1.73, significant at the .05 level. This indicates that the Monitor-modeling group showed a significantly greater amount of growth in facilitative skills over the four month period, even though there were no significant differences

between the post-test scores of the two groups.

- -

Insert Table 5 about here

- -

In summary, the data yielded the following results. First, following their particular form of practicum supervision, the Monitor-modeling group changed significantly in the direction of increased facilitative skills, while the Immediate-feedback group did not. Second, although significant differences did not exist between the mean judges' ratings of the two groups on the post-test, the results were in the intended direction with the Monitor-modeling group rated higher, and the probability level is encouraging ($p < .09$). Finally, it was indicated that the Monitor-modeling group evidenced a significantly greater amount of growth in facilitative skills over the four month period, as indicated by a significant difference between pre to post-test change in judges' ratings for the two groups.

Discussion

In a previous study (Silverman & Quinn, in press), analyses of judges' single global ratings of the sessions indicated that exposure to Monitor-modeling supervision fostered a greater amount of growth in facilitative skills than did exposure to Immediate-feedback supervision. However, both groups grew significantly during the course, as well as there being no significant differences in post-test ratings. In this present study, the analyses of the data generated by the judges' mean ratings of individual trainee responses, rather than singular global ratings, reveal a consistent impression of the relative effectiveness of the Monitor-modeling supervision. Although

there were still no significant differences between the two groups on the post-test, Analysis of covariance yielded an encouraging probability level of .09. Also, only the Monitor-modeling group was rated significantly higher from pre to post: the Immediate-feedback group did not show significant gains over the course of the semester. Though the Immediate-feedback situation provided supervision directly after each counseling session, the Monitor-modeling situation provided on the spot feedback during the sessions. The role of the supervisor as an active participant in the counseling process, serving as both "monitor" and "model" to the trainee, as a "collaborator" rather than as an "evaluator," seemed to have a positive effect on the level of facilitative functioning reached by the trainees.

It is important to note that there were only four supervisory sessions during the semester. Only three hours of a total of over 75 hours of class time was spent in direct supervision of actual counseling sessions with live clients. This is by no means thought to be an ideal amount of supervision in a practicum, but, even with this rather meager amount of direct supervision, the Monitor-modeling group grew significantly in counseling skills as measured by the judges' ratings on the Carkhuff scale. Furthermore, the only times that the Monitor-modeling trainees saw live clients alone was for the pre and post-practicum 10 minute sessions with coached clients. The Immediate-feedback trainees interviewed live clients alone for four seesions during the practicum, in addition to the pre and post-practicum sessions with coached clients. Still, the results indicate that with the Monitor-modeling approach of having the supervisor act as a less

threatening, collaborative, co-counselor during the actual counseling sessions, there was significant growth in facilitative skills, while with the Immediate-feedback method of having the supervisor evaluate the tapes after the counseling sessions, there was not significant growth.

The investigators would feel that the results support the relative effectiveness of the Monitor-modeling supervision. It is suggested that more emphasis in supervision should be placed on the promotion of the collaborative, team feeling between supervisor and trainee, and Monitor-modeling is offered as an appropriate model for further facilitating this emotional climate. Finally, since the number of trainees in this study was small, and the situation of the study a local one, the investigators suggest that further explorations of the effectiveness of Monitor-modeling supervision are warranted. It would be especially important to examine the effects of Monitor-modeling supervision in situations where the number of trainees, the length of the practicum, the number of supervisor sessions, and the number of universities involved were all increased.

References

Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and Human Relations. Vol. 1. Selection and Training. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Cash, W. L. & Munger, P. F. Counselors and their preparation. Review of Educational Research. 1966, 36, 256-263.

Cornwell, H. Reaction of clients and counselors to a beginning counseling practicum, unpublished Specialist project, The University of Kansas, 1959. In: Cottle, W. C. & Downie, N. M. Procedures and Preparation for Counseling. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Dreikurs, R. Techniques and dynamics of multiple psychotherapy. Psychiatric Quarterly. 1950, 24, 788-799.

Freund, J. E. & Williams, F. J. Elementary Business Statistics: A Modern Approach. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 267.

Hansen, J. C., & Warner, R. W. Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision. 1971, 10, 261-272.

Lott, G. M. The training of non-medical cooperative psychotherapists by multiple psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychotherapy. 1952, 6, 440-448.

Lott, G. M. Multiple psychotherapy: efficient use of psychiatric treatment and training time. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement. 1957, 31, 276-293.

Mallers, P. B. Team counseling in counselor education. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1968, 46, 981-983.

Patterson, C. H. Supervising students in the counseling practicum. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1964, 11, 47-53.

Silverman, M. S. Perceptions of counseling following differential practicum experiences. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1972, 19, 11-15.

Silverman, M. S. & Quinn, P. F. Monitor-modeling supervision in practicum. Loyola University School of Education (in press).

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, pp. 24-45.

Footnotes

1. Requests for reprints should be sent to Manuel S. Silverman, Department of Guidance and Counseling, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

2. Due to lack of funds and additional faculty, the investigators, in their normal faculty roles, served as two of the three supervisors. This situation was unavoidable, and an extremely conscious effort was made to provide unbiased supervision to all trainees.

3. For a more complete description of the various practicum activities see: Silverman (1972) and Silverman & Quinn (in press).

TABLE 1

Counselor-in-training Characteristics

Characteristic	Monitor-modeling	Immediate-feedback
$\bar{X}$ Age	30.8	30.0
Sex:		
Male	2	3
Female	10	9
Level of Training:		
master's candidate	12	10
post master's work	0	1
doctoral student	0	1
$\bar{X}$ years of teaching experience	5.75	7.67
Total years of counseling experience	$1\frac{1}{2}$	$2\frac{1}{2}$
Marital Status:		
single	7	8
married	4	2
religious	1	2

TABLE 2

Comparison of Pre and Post-practicum

Judges' Ratings for Monitor-modeling Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Judges' rating	difference	df	t
Monitor-modeling Pre-test	1.55	.65	22	3.55**
Monitor-modeling Post-test	2.20			

**$p < .01$

TABLE 3

Comparison of Pre and Post-practicum

Judges' Ratings for Immediate-feedback Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Judges' rating	difference	df	t
Immediate-feedback Pre-test	1.76	.13	22	.50
Immediate-feedback Post-test	1.89			

TABLE 4

Analysis of Covariance: Comparison of Post-practicum Judges' Ratings for Monitor-modeling and Immediate-feedback Groups

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	4.713	22		
Error	4.105	21	.195	
Treatments	.610	1	.610	3.13*

*$p \leq .09$

TABLE 5

Comparison of Pre to Post-Practicum Changes

in Judges' Ratings between Monitor-modeling and Immediate-feedback Groups

Source	$\bar{X}$ Change in Judges' Ratings	Difference	df	t
Monitor-modeling	.65	.52	22	2.45*
Immediate-feedback	.13			

*$p < .05$